

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

---

BRYAN S. REICHEL,

Case No. 24-cv-4154 (LMP)

Appellant,

v.

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

MARYJO JENSEN-CARTER, Trustee,

Appellee.

---

On March 19, 2025, this Court affirmed the decision of United States Bankruptcy Judge Katherine A. Constantine, which denied Appellant Bryan S. Reichel’s (“Reichel”) motion to dismiss certain creditors’ claims against his bankruptcy estate for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. ECF No. 17. Reichel now requests permission to file a motion for this Court to reconsider its March 19, 2025 order. ECF No. 18.

Local Rule 7.1(j) prohibits filing a motion to reconsider without leave of court. A party may receive permission to file a motion to reconsider only by showing “compelling circumstances.” L.R. 7.1(j). “Motions for reconsideration serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Hagerman v. Yukon Energy Corp.*, 839 F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988) (citation omitted). “A motion to reconsider cannot be employed to repeat arguments previously made, introduce evidence or arguments that could have been made earlier or tender new legal theories for the first time.” *Eng’g & Constr. Innovations, Inc. v. Bradshaw Constr. Corp.*, No. 20-cv-0808 (WMW/TNL), 2022 WL 5249648, at \*1 (D. Minn. Oct. 6, 2022).

Reichel does not purport to present newly discovered evidence and instead suggests that the Court's March 19, 2025 order contains clear legal errors that create a "manifest injustice." ECF No. 18. But Reichel merely repeats arguments previously made or advances arguments that this Court (and other courts) previously rejected. Notwithstanding Reichel's firm conviction that his criminal sentence was tainted by allegedly false claims against his bankruptcy estate, the arguments presented in his request do not align with the "limited function" of a motion to reconsider. *Hagerman*, 839 F.2d at 414. Therefore, Reichel fails to demonstrate the existence of "compelling circumstances" as is necessary to seek reconsideration under Local Rule 7.1(j).

### **ORDER**

Based upon the foregoing, and all the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Reichel's Request for Reconsideration (ECF No. 18) is **DENIED**.

Dated: April 17, 2025

*s/Laura M. Provinzino*  
Laura M. Provinzino  
United States District Judge